RTIP ID# *(required)* **LA0G626**

TCWG Consideration Date: September 2013

Project Description *(clearly describe project)*
The Federal Transit Administration is the lead agency under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this project. FTA and Metro propose to implement a light rail transit (LRT) project that would extend the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the existing Atlantic Station to the east by 6.9 to 9.5 miles, dependent on the alignment selected.

The Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project area encompasses over 50 square miles of communities to the east and southeast of downtown Los Angeles. The project area includes portions of the cities of Commerce, Los Angeles, Montebello, Monterey Park, Pico Rivera, Rosemead, Santa Fe Springs, South El Monte, Whittier, and portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County, which include East Los Angeles and west Whittier-Los Nietos.

The alternatives being evaluated include: No Build Alternative; Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative; State Route 60 (SR 60) Light Rail Transit (LRT) Alternative (with an SR 60 North Side Design Variation); and the Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative.

The SR 60 LRT Alternative would extend the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension 6.9 miles east, beginning at the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Atlantic Station at-grade and extend in an eastward direction terminating in the vicinity of the SR 60/Peck Road interchange. The Washington Boulevard LRT Alternative would extend the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension 9.5 miles southeast, beginning at the existing Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension Atlantic Station at-grade and extend in an southeastward direction terminating in the vicinity of the Washington Boulevard and Lambert Road intersection. Figure 1 shows all of the possible LRT routes and stations being studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).

See Description of Alternatives attachment for additional detail.

Type of Project *(use Table 1 on instruction sheet)*
Bus (Metro's fleet is currently and will be predominantly clean natural gas at project build-out), rail, or inter-modal facility/terminal/transfer point.

County	**Narrative Location/Route & Postmiles:**
Los Angeles County	The project study area is located in eastern Los Angeles County and is generally bounded by Pomona Boulevard and SR 60 to the north, Peck Road and Painter Avenue to the east, Olympic and Washington Boulevards to the south, and Atlantic Boulevard to the west. **Caltrans Projects – EA# N/A**

Lead Agency: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)

Contact Person	**Phone#**	**Fax#**	**Email**
Laura Cornejo, Director	213-922-2885		cornejol@metro.net

Hot Spot Pollutant of Concern *(check one or both)* **PM2.5 X** **PM10 X**

Federal Action for which Project-Level PM Conformity is Needed *(check appropriate box)*

Categorical Exclusion (NEPA)	✓ **EA or Draft EIS**	**FONSI or Final EIS**	**PS&E or Construction**	**Other**

Scheduled Date of Federal Action: May 2014

NEPA Assignment – Project Type *(check appropriate box)*

Exempt	**Section 326 –Categorical Exemption**	✓ **Section 327 – Non-Categorical Exemption**

Current Programming Dates *(as appropriate)*

	PE/Environmental	ENG	ROW	CON
Start	2010	2017	2023	2027
End	2015	2019	2025	2032

Project Purpose and Need (Summary): *(attach additional sheets as necessary)*

The purpose of the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 Project is to provide area residents, businesses, and transit dependent populations with a transit alternative connecting them to the rest of Los Angeles County via the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension and the regional rail system. In doing so, the project would improve mobility within the project area and offer a more sustainable transit alternative to address increased travel demand and projected growth, and meet the following objectives:

- Serve the large number of transit dependent and low-income residents in the project area;
- Increase access to major employment centers, activity centers, and destinations in the project area and Los Angeles County;
- Leverage transit investments from the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension and Measure R projects to provide connections farther east; and
- Provide transit alternatives to alleviate roadway congestion, improve mobility options for enhanced quality of life, and provide a convenient and reliable alternative to the automobile.

In evaluating the mobility and travel conditions within the project area, a number of themes have emerged that articulate the need for a transit improvement in the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project area:

- Alleviate peak-hour congestion on the roadway network by providing transit alternatives to meet increased demand;
- Provide additional travel options, given the project area's high travel demand and connectivity constraints;
- Effectively connect people to the concentration of activity centers that exists within, and adjacent to, the project area;
- Address the demand for transit service and meet the needs of transit dependent populations;
- Accommodate areas of increased population and employment growth;
- Encourage transit-supportive land use and economic development opportunities; and
- Increase environmental benefits to meet air quality and state mandates.

See attachment for additional detail.

Surrounding Land Use/Traffic Generators *(especially effect on diesel traffic)*

The project area consists of a variety of land uses. In the project area, the majority of multi-family residential land uses are generally located in the west. Single-family residential land uses are generally located in the northern and southeast portions of the project area. Industrial uses are generally located in the southern portion of the project area. Whittier Narrows, which is located in the northeast portion of the project area, is the largest area of parkland and open space in the project area. Additionally, commercial uses tend to be concentrated along major roadway and freeway corridors in the project area.

Business and industrial parks, which generate large volume of truck traffic, are concentrated in the cities of Commerce, South El Monte, and Industry. These areas provide a range of employment opportunities including industrial, major retail, and office.

Opening Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility
The project proposes to implement a LRT that would extend the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the existing Atlantic Station to the east. The proposed project would not result in an increase in trucks and does not involve diesel trucks. The build alternatives involve electric light rail. The TSM alternative would enhance existing bus service and would add additional bus routes to the project area. However, the additional buses associated with the TSM Alternative would run on clean natural gas. In addition, the TSM, SR 60 LRT, and Washington Boulevard LRT alternatives would result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and would reduce the number of vehicles on the roadways in the project area. Note that analysis was not conducted for the opening year; however, opening year results would be similar to those in the horizon year where the TSM and Project Alternatives would result in a reduction in VMTs.

RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility
The project proposes to implement a LRT that would extend the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the existing Atlantic Station to the east. The proposed project would not result in an increase in trucks and does not involve diesel trucks. The build alternatives involve electric light rail. The TSM alternative would enhance existing bus service and would add additional bus routes to the project area. However, the additional buses associated with the TSM Alternative would run on clean natural gas. In addition, the TSM, SR 60 LRT, and Washington Boulevard LRT alternatives would result in a reduction in VMTs and would reduce the number of vehicles on the roadways in the project area.

Opening Year: If facility is an interchange(s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT
The project does not involve a new interchange, reconfiguration of an existing interchange, intersection channelization or signalization. The project proposes to implement an electric LRT that would extend the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the existing Atlantic Station to the east.

RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: If facility is an interchange (s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT
The project does not involve a new interchange, reconfiguration of an existing interchange, intersection channelization or signalization. The project proposes to implement an electric LRT that would extend the Metro Gold Line Eastside Extension from the existing Atlantic Station to the east.

Describe potential traffic redistribution effects of congestion relief *(impact on other facilities)*
The project would result in decreases to area-wide VMT, including along major arterials and cross-streets. As such, there is not anticipated to be a substantial redistribution of vehicles between major roadways. Note that since the Washington Blvd. LRT Alternative would eliminate one travel lane in each direction on portions of Washington Boulevard, there would be the potential for redistribution of vehicles to parallel routes, such as Whittier Boulevard or Beverly Boulevard. This likelihood of vehicle redistribution was examined using the LA Metro travel demand model. Overall, it was determined that the potential for a shift in vehicles would be minimal, due to the distance to this parallel routes and origin/destination of the vehicle trips.

Comments/Explanation/Details *(attach additional sheets as necessary)*
The proposed project is not a project of air quality concern because the project does not meet the following criteria (underlined text indicates answers to 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) criteria for Projects of Air Quality Concern:

(i) New or expanded highway projects that have a significant number of or significant increase in diesel vehicles.

The proposed project is not a highway project and would not result in an increase in diesel vehicles.

(ii) Projects affecting intersections that are at Level-of-Service D, E, or F with a significant number of diesel vehicles, or those that will change to Level-of-Service D, E, or F because of increased traffic volumes from a significant number of diesel vehicles related to the project.

Although the Level-of-Service would deteriorate for some intersections along the SR 60 LRT and Washington Boulevard LRT alignments, the percentage of trucks is relatively low (less than five percent) at the study area intersections. There may be an increased delay on diesel trucks at these intersections, but the number of diesel trucks in the area is relatively low. In addition, the build alternatives involve electric light rail and would not result in an increase in diesel vehicles. The TSM Alternative would enhance existing bus service and would add additional bus routes to the project area. However, the additional buses associated with the TSM Alternative would run on clean natural gas.

(iii) New bus and rail terminals and transfer points than have a significant number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single location.

The proposed project is public transportation project that involves electric LRT. The proposed project does not involve the transport of goods, which would result in the congregation of diesel vehicles at a single location. As indicated above, the proposed project would not result in an increase in diesel vehicles. The TSM alternative would enhance existing bus service and would add additional bus routes in the project area. However, the additional buses associated with the TSM Alternative would run on clean natural gas.

(iv) Expanded bus and rail terminals and transfer points that significantly increase the number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single location.

The project does not include expanded bus or rail terminals and transfer points.

(v) Projects in or affecting locations, areas, or categories of sites which are identified in the PM10 or PM2.5 applicable implementation plan or implementation plan submission, as appropriate, as sites of violation or possible violation.

The project would not adversely affect an area or location identified in the current PM2.5 implementation plan submission (2012 Air Quality Management Plan). Per the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan for the South Coast Air Basin, the project is shown to be in an area that will be in compliance with the Federal PM2.5 ambient air quality standards by 2014. In addition, the project would reduce regional emissions of particulate matter (both PM10 and PM2.5), as documented in the Eastside Phase 2 EIS/EIR. Finally, the U.S. EPA recently (June 26, 2013, 78 FR 38223) redesignated the South Coast Air Basin as an attainment area for the Federal PM10 ambient air quality standard, indicating that the region has attained the PM10 standard for at least three years.